

COMMONWEALTH BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL  
PARASITOLOGY (HELMINTHOLOGY),  
WINCHES FARM,

VOLUME 8. Double-Part 10/11  
pp. 283-318, T.P.—XXVIII

395, HATFIELD ROAD,  
ST. ALBANS, HERTS. 30th September 1954

# THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

1954 Oct. 23

The Official Organ of  
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON  
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by

**FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**

*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

**LONDON:**

Printed by Order of the International Trust for  
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature  
by the International Trust  
at its Publications Office,  
41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1954

Price One Pound, Ten Shillings  
(All rights reserved)

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

### A. The Officers of the Commission

*Honorary Life President* : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History)*,  
*Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

---

*President* : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

*Vice-President* : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*)

*Secretary* : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*)

### B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Instituto Butantan, Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)

Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Professor Béla Hankó (*Mezőgazdasági Múzeum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)

Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)



## BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

---

Volume 8, Double-Part, 10/11 (pp. 283-318, T.P.—XXVIII) 30th September 1954

---

### EDITORIAL NOTE

The present Part contains the four concluding papers in regard to the Cases dealt with in the present volume which were considered by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953, but which were received too late for publication prior to the meeting of the Colloquium. These documents were submitted to the Colloquium in mimeographed form. They are now published, in order to complete the record of the documentation submitted in regard to the foregoing Cases.

These documents are the Reports prepared by the Secretary to the Commission in response to the invitation addressed to him by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948.



**ADDENDUM**

**REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE COLLOQUIUM ON  
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, COPENHAGEN, 1953, BY  
THE SECRETARY TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION  
ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE ON THE THREE  
MAJOR NOMENCLATORIAL PROBLEMS DISCUSSED IN  
THE PRESENT VOLUME**





CASE NO. 1

The problem of securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature

(continued from page 108)

DOCUMENT 1/59

FIRST REPORT by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

Stabilisation of Zoological Nomenclature, Part 1:

The Suggested Law of Prescription

(Circulated to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature on 29th July, 1953  
as Paper Z.N.(C.) 16)

**Origin of the present investigation :** At the Paris (1948) Congress two proposals were brought forward in favour of the introduction of a Law of Prescription which would limit the operation of the Law of Priority in certain respects in the interest of maintaining names currently in common use ; the first of these proposals was brought forward by Lemche (*Copenhagen*), the second by Bonnet (*Toulouse*). Both these proposals were published in 1950 in vol. 3 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The preliminary discussion of this problem at Paris both showed the complexity of the problem and brought to light also considerable differences of opinion. It was accordingly decided (1) to defer the consideration of this matter until the Copenhagen (1953) Congress, (2) to broaden the issue by including in it all other possible ways of promoting stability in nomenclature, and (3) to invite me, as the Secretary to the International Commission, to undertake an investigation, in conjunction with interested zoologists, and to submit a full report to the Copenhagen Congress.<sup>1</sup>

**2. Consultations made and advice sought :** In March 1952 the Trust published a paper (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7: 148-188) in which I gave a survey of the various suggestions which had been made and of the issues which appeared to be involved and invited interested zoologists to furnish statements setting out their views as to the action which it was desirable should be taken at the Copenhagen Congress. The documents received in response to this appeal, together with various documents previously received by the Commission, have since been published in Parts 1/3 of vol. 8 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 234.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 5-108 of the present volume.

**3. The present separate treatment of the proposal for the recognition of a Law of Prescription:** In my 1952 survey I was inclined to take the view that the main issue in the field of stability was whether some form of a Law of Prescription should be introduced or whether, in place of this course, various other means there enumerated should be adopted to promote stability in zoological nomenclature. Looking back, it appears to me that, while from a practical point of view the foregoing might prove to represent the broad choice confronting the Colloquium, it by no means follows logically that this is the case, for, as pointed out in a number of the communications received in response to the 1952 appeal, it would be possible both to adopt some form of a Law of Prescription and, in addition, to adopt some or all of the various other measures which have been suggested. In view of the novel character of the proposal to recognise a Law of Prescription in the *Règles* and of its intrinsic importance, I have come to the conclusion that it might be convenient to the Colloquium to have before it a short Report summarising the various forms in which this proposal, or something substantially equivalent to it, have been put forward. In all there are ten of these proposals. The authors of these schemes, arranged in the order in which they were received by the Commission, are: (1) Bonnet; (2) Lemche's 1948 proposal; (3) an organised group of Austrian zoologists; (4) Ferrière; (5) Dammerman; (6) Daniel; (7) Blake; (8) Kiriakoff; (9) Mayr; (10) Bradley. Apart from Bradley's scheme which was received in 1952, all the schemes noted above were received at various dates between 1948 and 1951. These schemes are summarised in the following paragraphs.

**4. The Bonnet proposal:** The text of Professor Bonnet's proposal was published in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 177) and has been included in the Agenda for the Colloquium as Document 1/3.<sup>3</sup> His proposal, submitted early in 1948, is that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision that a generic name or a specific trivial name which has remained unused for a considerable time ("durant des nombreuses années") shall not, on grounds of priority, be substituted for a name which has been in use for a long time ("depuis longtemps utilisé"). Under this proposal difficult cases would be left to specialists to settle among themselves.

**5. The Lemche proposal of 1948:** The proposal brought forward in 1948 by Dr. Henning Lemche (on his own behalf and on that of a large group of Scandinavian zoologists) was published in the *Bulletin* in 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **3**: 158-161) together with the names of the supporting zoologists; and the operative portion of this proposal has been included on the Agenda for the Colloquium as Document 1/7<sup>4</sup>. Under this proposal it was suggested that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision that a generic name or specific trivial name published before 1850 and not used in scientific literature since 1st January 1850 is not to be rejected in favour of such other name as has been in general use for that genus or species since that date. A revision of this proposal was submitted by Lemche in 1952. See paragraph 13 below.

<sup>3</sup>See page 5.

<sup>4</sup>See page 8.



**6. The view put forward by the Austrian zoologists who have submitted statements on this subject :** The group of Austrian zoologists who have submitted representations in support of the Principle of Prescription favour the recognition of the principle that a name which has been consistently applied to an animal should not be displaced in favour of an older name solely on account of technical nomenclatorial considerations. This view was put forward in a letter addressed to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 in a communication, the text of which has since been published in the *Bulletin* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5**: 77-78). See also Document 1/9 in the Agenda for the Colloquium.<sup>5</sup>

**7. The Ferrière proposal :** The proposal submitted to the Commission by Dr. Ferrière (and placed also before the Ninth International Congress of Entomology at Amsterdam in 1951) is reproduced as Document 1/13 in the Agenda for the Colloquium.<sup>6</sup> Under this proposal, where a species remains unidentified for more than one hundred years, the name applied to that species (1) would be suppressed altogether if the original type specimen was no longer available, and (2), if the type specimen were to be available, would need to be redescribed in its appropriate modern genus before it could be accepted as an available name. Ferrière recognised that the crux of his proposal was the date to be assigned for purposes of priority to a hundred-year-old species redescribed in this way. On this critical issue he was able to suggest only that it should form the subject of discussion among specialists.

**8. The Dammerman proposal :** The proposal put forward by the late Dr. Dammerman—for which see Document 1/14 on the Colloquium Agenda<sup>7</sup>—is of a general character, although it was put forward specifically only in relation to the names of insects. The idea was that a definite start should be made towards preserving specific trivial names belonging to two important classes, namely (a) names of species which are the type species of genera which, in turn, are the type genera of families, and (b) names of species of economic importance. The proposal was that, under a system of co-operation to be established among leading specialists, a specified number of names of the foregoing classes should be studied annually, that the results of those studies should be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and that, if after the expiry of a period of one year from the date of such publication, a given name received a two-third vote, that name would thereupon become fully protected against rejection on any ground.

**9. The Daniel proposal :** The proposal submitted to the Commission by Dr. Franz Daniel is reproduced as Document 1/25 on the Colloquium Agenda.<sup>8</sup> Dr. Daniel's scheme is similar generally to the Dammerman proposal in that it contemplates progress being achieved through proposals to be submitted by relatively small groups of specialists in particular groups of the Animal Kingdom.

---

<sup>5</sup>See page 13.

<sup>6</sup>See page 20.

<sup>7</sup>See pages 21-22.

<sup>8</sup>See pages 46-47.

**10. The Blake proposal:** Blake (Document D 1/31 on the Colloquium Agenda<sup>9</sup>) put forward a suggestion in favour of the insertion in the *Règles* of a Statute of Limitation. Under this proposal which, in his covering letter Blake stated was, in part, derivative from ideas suggested by Mayr, the exclusive and uncontested application of a given name to a particular species for a period of fifty years or more would be deemed to constitute conclusive evidence that the name was correctly so applied, provided that the name had been used at least three times during that period. Similarly a name would be protected where it had been applied for 70 years or more to a given species, even if on not more than three occasions during the 70-year period the name in question had not been so called.

**11. The Kiriakoff proposal:** Kiriakoff is opposed to the introduction of a Law of Prescription; he proposes, however, a much more drastic scheme (see Document D. 1/32 on the Colloquium Agenda<sup>10</sup>), under which after a date to be specified no further changes in the names of genera or species would be permitted and any book published before that date which contained names for genera or species at present known by later names would be treated as non-existent for nomenclatorial purposes.

**12. The Mayr proposal:** In Document 1/45 on the Colloquium Agenda<sup>11</sup> Mayr puts forward a proposal which resembles the Blake proposal (paragraph 10 above), which latter (as already explained) is stated by its author to be in part derived from ideas suggested by Mayr. Under this proposal three new categories of status would be recognised for names: (1) that of the "*nomen conservatum*," to which would belong any name expressly preserved by the Commission and placed on either of the *Official Lists*; (2) that of "*nomen conservandum*," to which would belong (i) all names on the *Official Lists* other than "*nomina conservata*," and (ii) any name in current use for the conservation of which a petition to the Commission is pending; (3) that of "presumptive '*nomen conservandum*'" to which would belong (i) the name of any genus which is the type-genus of a suprageneric category; (ii) any name (otherwise available) which has been used exclusively or virtually exclusively for a period of 50 years or more, provided that the name in question has been used at least ten times in the literature, or for a period of 30 years where the name in question has been used 100 times or more during the period. Under this scheme the Law of Priority would not apply to "*nomina conservanda*" or to "presumptive *nomina conservanda*" in such a way as to disturb usage without prior reference to the Commission. It would be the duty of zoologists to bring such cases to the attention of the Commission.

**13. The present Lemche proposal:** Lemche's present proposal is given in Document 1/46 on the Colloquium Agenda.<sup>12</sup> This scheme differs in form from any of the others that have been proposed in that, under it, the burden of searching the literature for the purpose of finding cases where a practically

---

<sup>9</sup>See pages 56-57.

<sup>10</sup>See page 58.

<sup>11</sup>See pages 76-77.

<sup>12</sup>See page 78.



unknown name has been used, would be thrown upon the author who wished on grounds of priority to use some name (name "A") in preference to the later name (name "B") currently in use. Such an author would be required not merely to show that the names "A" and "B" belong to the same species and that the name "A" is older than the name "B," but also that the name "A" has been used for the species concerned in preference to the name "B" at least (—) times during a period of (—) years from the time at which the author concerned desires to substitute the older name "A" for the currently accepted name "B." This scheme would base prescriptive right for the name "B" upon the non-usage of the name "A"—or the usage of that name on not more than (—) occasions—in a specified recent period. The length of the period to be selected and the number of occasions on which, during that period usage of name "A" occurred, would be a matter for separate discussion.

**14. The Bradley proposal :** In Document 1/50 on the Colloquium Agenda<sup>13</sup> Bradley, while expressly supporting the idea of a Law of Prescription, puts forward a scheme which is in fact closely allied to that advocated by Mayr (paragraph 12). Under this proposal a name which has been "virtually exclusively in use" for a specified period, or has been so used in a specified number of publications, shall be presumed to be a "*nomen conservandum*"; that is, it shall not be permissible for a zoologist who observes what he deems to be a nomenclational defect in such a name to reject it under any provision of the *Règles*, it being his duty in such a situation to report the case to the Commission. Such cases would be decided by the Commission under its ordinary—that is, not under its Plenary—powers and, where the Commission considered that the name qualified for conservation, would place it on the appropriate *Official List*.

**15. Support received for the idea of inserting in the "Règles" a provision embodying a Law of Prescription :** It will be seen from the foregoing particulars that the idea of inserting in the *Règles* a provision embodying a Law of Prescription in one form or another has attracted a substantial measure of support. In addition to the authors of the actual schemes put forward this idea is supported also, though with qualifications, by : (1) The Nomenclature Committee of the American Museum of Natural History, New York (Document D.1/41 on the Colloquium Agenda<sup>14</sup>) pointed out that a Law of Prescription would involve an exhaustive search into the entire literature, a search which the committee regarded as "probably an impossible task." The Committee did not however rule out the possibility of devising a scheme under which a name might acquire a prescriptive right where it had been used with moderate consistency in comprehensive treatments of the group concerned, by calling in aid some Statute of Limitations. The Committee added that Mayr (one of its members) had suggested that the period for acquiring a prescriptive right might be reduced from 100 to 50 years and that usage in synonymies should be disregarded. (2) China (Document

---

<sup>13</sup>See pages 86-87.

<sup>14</sup>See pages 71-72.



D. 1/52)<sup>15</sup> considers that a properly worked-out Law of Prescription would be a great help in stabilising nomenclature, but that (a) the period for acquiring a prescriptive right should be set at 40 years, and (b) that the new provision should not be retrospective to the period lying behind the date on which it was adopted; in other words, the new rule would apply only to cases where for 40 years after its introduction the name in question had been applied in a uniform manner.

**16. Opposition to the recognition in the "Règles" of the principle of Prescription:** While, as noted in the preceding paragraph, considerable support has been expressed for the proposed incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying a Law of Prescription or its equivalent, it must here be noted that this proposal has excited also considerable opposition. It is rather difficult to analyse the grounds upon which various authors have based their objection, but it is clear that some hold that such a scheme would be impracticable, while others regard it as unsound in principle, infringing the Law of Priority without securing a sufficient countervailing advantage. Some who have expressed opposition to the idea of a Law of Prescription have taken the stand that the promotion of stability in nomenclature could be achieved more satisfactorily by the adoption of the other measures suggested in my 1952 paper and, perhaps because of the form in which the questions at the end of that paper were drafted, have not made it clear whether they would in all circumstances be opposed to the adoption also of a Law of Prescription. Those who have expressed themselves as being opposed, for one reason or another, to such a provision include: (1) di Caporiacco (D. 1/5<sup>16</sup>); (2) Holthuis (D. 1/23<sup>17</sup>); (3) Hopkins (D. 1/24<sup>18</sup>); (4) Arkell (D. 1/29<sup>19</sup>); (5) Dymond (D. 1/30<sup>20</sup>); (6) Kiriakoff (D. 1/32<sup>21</sup>); (7) Cabrera (D. 1/36<sup>22</sup>); (8) Keen & Muller (D. 1/40<sup>23</sup>); (9) Wright (D. 1/43<sup>24</sup>); (10) Lochhead (D. 1/47<sup>25</sup>); (11) Hall (D. 1/48<sup>26</sup>); (12) Townes (D. 1/49, Annexe 127). To the foregoing must certainly be added the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. (D. 1/8<sup>28</sup> and D. 1/42<sup>29</sup>), for, although in neither of the statements furnished by the Group is opposition to the recognition of the Principles of Prescription expressly stated, the purpose of both statements is to circumscribe and limit the use of the Commission's Plenary Powers, an object which would be wholly inconsistent with support for the relaxation of the Priority Principle through the incorporation into the *Règles* of a provision recognising Prescription.

(Signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,  
Secretary of the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.

Temporary Secretariat of the Commission,  
Hotel Excelsior,  
Copenhagen,  
Denmark.

29th July, 1953.

<sup>15</sup>See pages 97-98.

<sup>16</sup>See page 7.

<sup>17</sup>See page 44.

<sup>18</sup>See page 45.

<sup>19</sup>See page 55.

<sup>20</sup>See page 55.

<sup>21</sup>See page 58. See also paragraph 11 of the present Report.

<sup>22</sup>See pages 66-67.

<sup>23</sup>See page 70.

<sup>24</sup>See page 75.

<sup>25</sup>See pages 79-80.

<sup>26</sup>See page 80.

<sup>27</sup>See page 81.

<sup>28</sup>See pages 9-12.

<sup>29</sup>See pages 73-75.

DOCUMENT 1/60

SECOND REPORT by FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.  
(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**Stabilisation of Zoological Nomenclature, Part 2: Possible  
measures other than the adoption of the Principle of  
Prescription**

(Circulated to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature as Paper Z.N.(C.)17 on 29th July, 1953, simultaneously with the Secretary's First Report (Document D.1/59))

In my immediately preceding Report (Paper Z.N.(C.)16) I have given a summary of the suggestions which have been made in favour of the incorporation into the *Règles* of provisions recognising the Principle of Prescription. I dealt with this subject separately in the foregoing Report, mainly because the documentation relating to it was much more voluminous than that relating to any other matter in the group of proposals expressly concerned with the promotion of stability in nomenclature. The purpose of the present Report is to give a list of the proposals which have been received in regard relating to the promotion of nomenclatorial stability, other than the suggested recognition of the Principle of Prescription:—

- (1) Proposed addition of a Preamble to the *Règles* making it clear that their object is to promote uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature.
- (2) Proposed rewording of the Plenary Powers provisions to make it clear that the object of the grant of those Powers is to promote uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature.
- (3) Proposed establishment of an *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Zoological Publications*.
- (4) Proposed suppression of unrecognisable (and unrecognised) “nomina dubia.”
- (5) Proposed introduction of means for determining the locality to be accepted for nomenclatorial purposes as the original locality of the nominotypical (nominated) subspecies of a polytypic species in cases where the information contained in the original description was insufficiently precise or was incorrect or where no information on this question was given by the original author.
- (6) Question whether provisions similar to those suggested in (5) above are desirable for the purpose of determining for nomenclatorial

purposes the situation in which the type material of fossil species was obtained when the original description contains no, or inadequate, information on this subject.

- (7) Question in relation to the determination for nomenclatorial purposes of the host species of a parasitic species in situations similar to those indicated in (6) above.
- (8) The development of the use of the Commission's Plenary Powers.
- (9) Development of the "*Official List*" system as an agency for the promotion of stability and uniformity in zoological nomenclature.

2. In connection with the matters enumerated above, it should be noted that no proposals have been brought forward for the extension of the Commission's Plenary Powers, it being considered that the existing provisions are adequate for the purpose of promoting stability and uniformity in nomenclature. It must be noted, however, that among the papers submitted there is a proposed (Document 1/42<sup>30</sup>) submitted by the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, for restricting the Plenary Powers within a narrower field than at present.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Temporary Secretariat of the Commission,  
Hotel Excelsior,  
Copenhagen,  
Denmark.

29th July, 1953.

---

<sup>30</sup>See pages 73-75 also pages 9-12.



## CASE NO. 2

### The question whether "neotypes" should be recognised in the "Règles" as a category of type specimen

(Continued from page 166)

## DOCUMENT 2/38

### REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF THE RECOGNITION OF NEOTYPES AS A CATEGORY OF TYPE SPECIMEN

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Circulated to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature on  
27th July, 1953, as Paper Z.N.(C.)15)

**Origin of the present investigation :** The present investigation was undertaken in response to a request made at the Paris (1948) Congress (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 192-193).

**2. Consultations undertaken :** In March 1952 the Trust published (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 131-147) a paper in which, as Secretary to the Commission, I reviewed the problems which, as it seemed to me, were involved in the proposal that "neotypes" should be recognised as a category of type specimen and appealed to specialists for advice. The documents received in response to this appeal, together with certain others previously submitted to the Commission, have been included in the Colloquium Agenda as Documents D.2/1 to D.2/37 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **8** : 109-168).

**3. The main issues involved :** There are two main issues involved, namely : (1) Is it desirable in any circumstances that "neotypes" should be recognised as a category of type specimen ? If the answers to the above question is "yes," the second and equally important question is : (2) Shall the creation of definitive and authoritative neotypes be limited to cases where specialists in the group concerned are of the opinion that a neotype (or some equivalent mechanism) is necessary to put an end to doubts as to the taxonomic species to which a given name is applicable by definitely attaching the name in question to a specimen which corresponds as closely as possible both with the original description and with the current interpretation of that description ? Or alternatively, is the creation of neotypes to be permitted wherever the holotype or lectotype is missing and, in the latter case, where there are no syntypes available for selection as the lectotype ? Clearly, if the answer to the first of these questions is in the negative, the whole problem disappears.

If, however, this question is answered in the affirmative, the choice between the second pair of alternatives becomes one of prime importance, for on the decision taken on this question will turn the whole of the provisions to be adopted. On the one hand, if the creation of large numbers of neotypes is to be permitted, the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* can be of only the most general character and can be little more than recommendations to authors as to the principles which they should follow in creating neotypes. If on the other hand, the decision is in favour of the adoption of provisions permitting the establishment of neotypes only in exceptional circumstances in relation to well-known names in common use where specialists feel that this is necessary for the purposes of their taxonomic work (i.e., to prevent confusion and to promote uniformity), the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* could be given a precise character and could be accompanied by safeguards on such matters as publicity, consultation, preservation and location of, and access to, neotypes, which would be impracticable if the number of neotypes to be created was large and if it were to be possible for any worker to create neotypes at his sole discretion.

**4. Answers received (documents published in volume 8 of the "Bulletin") :** In a consultation undertaken by correspondence—as contrasted with a round-table discussion—it is often difficult, if not impossible, to tabulate the replies received in cases, such as the present, where overlapping possibilities are involved. In the present case there is a minority which is opposed to the grant of any official recognition of neotypes and a majority which is in favour of such recognition. It is clear, however, that some part of the body of workers who make up this majority would join the opponents of neotypes, unless the scheme were one which provided for the creation of only small numbers of neotypes under rigorous safeguards. In a considerable number of cases, however, the comments submitted are based upon the assumption that basically the scheme should be one under which it would be open to any worker to create neotypes without resort to any external authority. Inevitably, therefore, the safeguards suggested are in many cases of very meagre description.

**5. Questions relating to safeguards and other matters on which decisions will be needed (1) if a decision in favour of neotypes is taken and (2) as soon as it has been decided whether the scheme is to be one under which neotypes were to be created only in small numbers and under rigorous safeguards or one under which individual workers would be free to create unlimited numbers of neotypes at their own discretion :** For the reasons explained above, it seems to me to be best to leave the various comments which have been received (and which have been published in Volume 8 of the *Bulletin*) to speak for themselves, and here to do no more than list the questions which have been raised, while noting that the answers to be given to those questions will inevitably differ greatly according to whether neotype-creation is to be left in the hands of individual specialists or is to be placed under the authority of the International Commission :

(A) *Scope of the Scheme* :—

- (1) Shall the creation of neotypes be limited to cases where the holotype and/or lectotype or, if there never were such, the syntypes of a species are known to have been lost or destroyed ?
- (2) Shall the creation of neotypes be permissible also where the holotype or lectotype is so damaged or incomplete as, in the opinion of specialists, to render unrecognisable the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species concerned ?
- (3) Shall the creation of neotypes be extended to cover also those nominal species which were named from figures or descriptions published by previous authors and thus never possessed any type specimens ? (This is the suggestion made by Kevan in Document D.2/11 (: 119) ; it is also discussed in Document D.2/29 (: 155) by Bradley who considers neotypes necessary in such cases.)

(B) *Relation of neotypes to surviving type material* :—

- (4) If neotypes are to be permitted only where the type material is believed to have been lost or destroyed, what is to be the status of the neotype if later the type material or some of it is rediscovered ? In such circumstances shall :
  - (a) the neotype prevail (in the interests of continuity and stability) or the rediscovered type material ?
  - or
  - (b) the neotype at once lose its status as the unique standard of reference for the identification of the nominal species concerned ? (If so, what is the advantage of establishing neotypes ?)

(C) *The problem of safeguards against the abuse of the neotype system* :—

- (5) Shall the rules provide that no specimen is eligible for selection as a neotype unless it is (or, prior to being so selected, becomes) the property of a museum or other scientific institution or be placed on permanent loan in the collections of such a museum or institution ?
- (6) Is it desirable that there should be rules which would prevent the development of a scramble by museums to accumulate neotypes for their institutions, without regard to the moral claims of other institutions ? For example, where types have been destroyed through an outbreak of fire at some museum, should that museum have a prior right to neotypes to be created in replacement of its destroyed types—in cases where that museum possesses material suitable for designation as neotypes ? By what means are such problems to be resolved ?
- (7) Whatever value neotypes may possess would, it is suggested, be lost if the scheme were so loose that it would be possible for two or more workers to set up neotypes independently in different parts of the



world. How is this to be avoided (see (15) below)? Or is this anomaly to be tolerated by introducing a rule that the principle of priority shall be applied for determining the relative status of competing neotypes?

- (8) Should it be made an essential condition for the creation of a neotype that the institution in which it is deposited (see (5) above) is one which can be reasonably relied upon to take proper care of neotypes confided to its care and to grant reasonable access to those neotypes to serious students?
- (9) Should it be made an essential condition to the establishment of a neotype that either the author establishing the neotype should publish a full description and/or figures of the specimen which he selects as such or should give a reference to a paper containing such a description and/or figure? If, for example, an author was required, when establishing a neotype, to do no more than give an "indication" of the meagre kind accepted under Proviso (a) to Article 25 for the description of a new species, what would be the value of the neotype so created?
- (10) It is assumed that everyone will agree that, if neotypes are to be given official recognition, the specimen selected to be the neotype should normally agree as closely as possible with the original description of the species concerned, e.g., in regard to such matters as sex, size, colouring, etc., though there may be cases where the difficulty of establishing the species to which a name in common use applies arises not only from the fact that the types are lost, but also from the fact that the description appears to have been based upon an aberrant, immature, or otherwise unrecognisable form. If the above represents the general view, what safeguards are desirable and necessary in order to ensure that a specimen selected as a neotype conforms with the above requirements?
- (11) Should a neotype normally be a specimen obtained from the original locality and/or, in the case of fossil species, the same horizon, as that from which the original material was described if this is known, provided that there is no reasonable doubt as to the accuracy of the type locality and/or type horizon cited in the original description? Would the actual locality and/or horizon from which the neotype was obtained automatically become the type locality of the species? This is a question of importance in polytypic species where it is necessary to consider the relationship of the nominotypical (or nominate) subspecies to other nominal subspecies established for the nominal species concerned.
- (12) It is assumed that the selection of neotypes by an author without adequate consultation with fellow workers would be regarded as reprehensible and not calculated to promote stability in the nomenclature of the group concerned. What measures should be

taken to ensure that adequate notice should be given to fellow workers before a neotype is established and that, before the establishment of a neotype, adequate regard has been paid to comments received from fellow workers during the period of notice ?

- (13) If it is granted that a definite period of notice should be given by an author proposing to establish a neotype, what should be the length of the period and by what means should this notice be given ?
- (14) Should it be made an essential requirement that, where the description of a species or its type locality has been more closely defined through restrictions by subsequent authors, an author proposing to establish a neotype for that species should be at liberty only to select as the neotype a specimen which conforms with those restrictions ?
- (15) Is it possible to provide adequate safeguards for dealing with the matters enumerated in (5) to (14) above if the establishment of neotypes is to be left entirely to the discretion of individual workers or can those safeguards be provided only if a neotype selection requires the final approval of the International Commission before it becomes effective ?

**6. Language in which the establishment of neotypes should be published :** Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, who attaches importance to the institution of adequate safeguards if neotypes are to be officially recognised, has added a suggestion (in Document D. 2/18 (: 129)) not previously made by any author, namely that it should be part of the scheme that no valid description of a neotype could be made in any language other than English, French, or German.

**7. Relation of nominal species for which neotypes are established to other "nomina dubia" :** The basis of the argument in favour of the recognition of neotypes is that, until this is done, it is not possible to recognise with certainty the taxonomic species represented by a given nominal species. In other words, the name of the nominal species for which a neotype is suggested is *nomen dubium*, though of a special kind. It belongs to that group of *nomina dubia* currently accepted, but which, in the absence of a mechanism not at present provided in the *Règles*, cannot be regarded as free from challenge. Further, within this group of *nomina dubia* there is a special sub-group where it is represented that some mechanism such as a neotype is required in order to provide for the further refinement needed when, with the advance of taxonomic knowledge, it is found that what for a hundred years or more was universally considered to be one species is actually a mixture of two or more species and where, as matters now stand, there is no means—owing to the lack of type material—of determining to which of the species concerned the name should apply. Two points arise here for consideration :—

- (1) Is it not essential that the rules to be adopted if neotypes are to

be officially recognised should provide explicitly that neotypes may be established only for the purpose of removing instability and confusion arising from doubts as to the taxonomic species represented by a given nominal species in cases where the name of that nominal species is in wide use and that in no circumstances may a neotype be established for the purpose of interpreting a name not in such use? (Then would follow the further rules, e.g., those relating to the loss, etc., of type material governing the creation of neotypes.) It is recognised that occasionally the mere existence of a *nomen dubium* may constitute a serious threat to the stability of the nomenclature of a given group, but it is suggested that the best way to remove a danger of this kind is to ask the Commission to suppress the name concerned.

- (2) Would it be possible to meet the object sought by those who advocate the establishment of neotypes by a different method and one perhaps more in harmony with the principles embodied in the *Règles* as they now stand and one which might be less open to objection from the point of view of those who dislike the whole idea of recognising neotypes as an official category of type specimen? This possibility is discussed further in paragraph 8 below.

**8. A possible alternative to the recognition of neotypes as an official category of type specimen:** As the *Règles* stand, the provisions in Article 25 (Proviso (a)), which confer availability upon generic and specific names, are quite unqualified and there is nothing in that Article which authorises later authors to act as revisers refining the definition of a nominal species afforded by the indication, definition or description published by the original author of the name. Nevertheless, the literature is full of examples where nominal species established by old authors are currently interpreted in accordance with decisions taken by authors who, acting as first revisers, have, in effect, said: "I interpret *X-us a-us* Martin, 1809, as being the species figured by Jones in 1850 as figure 1 on plate 14 of his work. (Here follows the [title of Jones's book])." Not infrequently still later authors, having access to the specimen represented as fig. 1 on Jones's plate 14, have either stated: "This specimen is the neotype of the nominal species *X-us a-us* Martin" or "In view of Jones's action in 1850 I here select this specimen, which bears the number so-and-so and is in the collection of the so-and-so Museum to be the neotype of this species." It is evident from the papers submitted to the International Commission by, for example, Stubblefield and Muir-Wood that a "restriction" of the foregoing kind without the selection of a neotype provides the information required by the taxonomist for his work. The first point which seems to me to emerge here is that, if neotypes are to be permitted to become an official category, restrictions of the foregoing kind, unaccompanied by the selection of a neotype, ought expressly to be banned. The second point<sup>31</sup> which seems to me to emerge just as strongly as the first is the question whether the establishment officially of a neotype is necessary at all in those

<sup>31</sup>See Muir-Wood (H. M.) and Stubblefield (C. J.), 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6**: 7-17; *id.*, 1951, *ibid.* **6**: 18-30.



cases, which appear to be numerous, where restrictions of what I here term the Stubblefield/Muir-Wood kind are found to be sufficient for taxonomic purposes. Accordingly, it seems to me to be a matter for consideration whether it would not be advantageous—and likely also to bridge the considerable differences which at present exist as to the conditions in which neotypes, if permitted at all, should be established—to have a twofold scheme under which when types were lost, etc. :—

- (1) The *Règles* would provide for (that is, give authority for) an author to define more closely the concept represented by a given nominal species by acting expressly as a first reviser (as in the imaginary case of the reviser Jones mentioned above), action so taken being binding upon subsequent workers; this would not preclude the subsequent intervention of a later author (let us say, Smith) acting as a second reviser if through the advance of taxonomic technique this were considered necessary. The kind of case that I have in mind where a second reviser might be required would be where the first reviser defined the meaning to be attached to a given nominal species by fixing the name of that species to a given published figure and where later the existence of a third species was discovered and it was not clear to which of two possible taxonomic species the figure selected by the first reviser was referable.
- (2) The *Règles* would provide further that, where workers in any given group were of the opinion that the action by a reviser acting under the powers specified in (1) above was calculated to create instability and confusion, the case should be referred to the International Commission which, after complying with rigorous provisions regarding consultation, the giving of public notice and the like should be empowered to reverse or modify the meaning attaching to a given name through the action of the reviser concerned, the power so conferred upon the Commission to include the power, where the Commission thought it desirable in the light of the views submitted to it by specialists, to specify a given specimen in some institution to constitute the unique standard of reference for the interpretation of the name of the nominal species concerned.

It will be observed that under a system of the kind described above :—

- (a) the maximum free play would be given to individual workers, provided that their action did not, in the opinion of their fellow workers, lead to confusion and instability in the nomenclature of the group concerned;
- (b) neotypes as such would not be granted an official status under the *Règles* and in consequence the strong objections felt by many to the grant to individuals (as contrasted with the Commission) of the virtually unfettered right to create “neotypes” in conditions which would be binding on other authors would be met, while the main point of those who advocate such a system (namely

their objection to the intervention by the Commission in this field) would also be met.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

Temporary Secretariat of the Commission,  
Hotel Excelsior,  
Copenhagen,  
Denmark.

27th July, 1953.

CASE NO. 3

**The question of the reform of the provisions in the "Règles" relating to the naming of families and lower suprageneric groups**

(continued from page 282)

**DOCUMENT 3/41**

**REPORT ON THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE REGULATION OF THE NAMING OF FAMILIES AND OTHER SUPRAGENERIC CATEGORIES BELOW THAT OF SUB-ORDER**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(circulated to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature on 23rd July, 1953 as Paper Z.N.(C.11)

**Material available :** The Paris Congress (1948)<sup>32</sup> asked that an investigation into the problems involved in the regulation of the naming of Families and other suprageneric Categories below the rank of Sub-Order should be undertaken, in conjunction with interested specialists, and a Report submitted for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953. In March 1952 the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature published a paper (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7: 61-94), in which I made a survey of the problems which appeared to call for decision and appealed to specialists to furnish statements setting out their views as to the action which it was desirable should be taken. The Trust has published the forty documents received on this subject in Part 6/9 of volume 10 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (: 167-282).

**2. Questions calling for decision :** The questions which call for decision are set out briefly below.

**(1) Shall the names of families and associated categories be subject to regulation at all?** The replies received show that there is unanimity in favour of including in the *Règles* some provisions for the regulation of the naming of families, etc., with the exception of Keen and Muller (Document 3/29).<sup>33</sup>

**(2) Shall the principle of priority be recognised in some form in the regulation of the naming of families, etc.?** If it is granted that

---

<sup>32</sup>See 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 138.

<sup>33</sup>See page 240.



there should be some provisions in the *Règles* governing the naming of families and associated groups, the next question to be considered is whether the principle of priority in some form or another is to be included in the rules. The whole nature of these rules turns upon the answer to be given to this question. For, if the principle of priority is not to be recognised, the rules would be confined to a few points only (e.g., adoption of a type genus as base of name; the termination to be adopted, etc.), there being no provision for determining which of a number of already published family names should be used when the type genera of those nominal families are regarded by taxonomists as belonging to the same nominal family. If however the principle of priority is to be recognised in any form—for the purpose of securing that in any given set of circumstances one family name shall be the nomenclatorially correct name to the exclusion of all others—the scheme will have to contain provisions for determining the date when a family, etc., name has been established, for dealing with synonymy of family names, for preventing homonymy in family names and kindred matters. In all the documents submitted, with the exception of that by Lemche (Document 3/28)<sup>34</sup> the recognition of the principle of priority is advocated.

**(3) Categories to be recognised :** Two questions are involved in the matters of the categories belonging to the family group to be recognised in the *Règles* : (a) For what categories shall special terminations be provided ? (b) shall any recognition be given to terms proposed for intermediate categories ? As regards the first of these questions, of the specialists who have furnished statements : (i) All favour the recognition of, and the adoption of prescribed endings for superfamilies, families, subfamilies and tribes, though there is not agreement as to the endings which it is desirable should be prescribed for the first and last of these categories. (ii) Some favour the recognition of supertribes and subtribes. (iii) Bradley suggests (Documents 3/37)<sup>35</sup> that provision should be made for other intermediate categories such as the cohort, a course which is strongly urged also by Kiriakoff (Document 3/23)<sup>36</sup>. (iv) There is fairly general agreement that it is not desirable to recognise the category supergenus. (v) Bradley (Document 3/37)<sup>37</sup> and others suggest that it would be sufficient if those authors who wish to make use of this category were to use for it the name of the genus concerned applying to it some descriptive epithet such as "supergenus." The first of the main questions referred to above (terminations to be used for the categories recognised) is discussed in paragraph (11) below.

**(4) Co-ordinate character of names for families and associated categories :** There is virtual unanimity that the names for families and suprageneric categories below the sub-ordinal level should be co-ordinate with one another, that is, that, when a name based upon the name of a contained genus (the type genus) is published with some termination to denote that it is intended to be the name of one of the foregoing categories, the same name is to be deemed to have been published also for all the other categories

---

<sup>34</sup>See pages 236-237.

<sup>35</sup>See page 278.

<sup>36</sup>See page 211.

<sup>37</sup>See pages 277-278.

concerned. There seems to be general agreement also that in every case the type unit of every category should be the type genus, that is, that it should not be the next lower category below the category concerned (i.e., that the type unit of a family should be a type genus and not a type-subfamily).

**(5) Suggested definition of the familial category :** If (see (4) above) names published for all the foregoing categories are to be co-ordinate with one another, they will all be subject to the same rules. For this purpose, as observed by Bradley, it will be convenient to devise some agreed omnibus expression which, by definition, applies to them all. A possible formula is suggested by Bradley (Document D.3/34)<sup>38</sup>.

**(6) Formation of names of units belonging to the familial group of categories :** There is complete agreement that names of units belonging to the familial category should (1) be based upon the name of the type genus, to which should be added a distinctive termination. The question for decision is in what form should the name of the type genus be incorporated. That the old rule that its "root" (French "radical") should be so taken is clearly unworkable, while even to take the "stem" (French : "thème") is not always easy. Bradley makes a suggestion (Document D.3/34)<sup>39</sup>, which is supported by the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature (Document D.3/35)<sup>40</sup> which is designed to overcome these difficulties.

**(7) Question whether any exceptions should be granted to the rule that a family name must be based upon the name of a contained genus which thus becomes the type genus :** There is general agreement that the loophole providing for the exceptional recognition of a family name not based upon the name of a contained genus recognised in *Opinion* 141<sup>41</sup> is unnecessary because obsolete and should be withdrawn.

**(8) Question whether, in order to secure availability, a family name, when first published, must be in a Latinised form :** In my 1952 Survey<sup>42</sup> I drew attention to the fact in the early part of the last century groupings now accepted as of familial rank had been established with vernacular names based upon the names of included genera, and I suggested that, if well-known names were not to be displaced, provision would need to be made to provide such names with availability. (I had in mind especially names with French endings published—notably in entomology—at the beginning of the XIXth century). The general view seems to be that the rule should provide that, in order to be accepted, the expressions should be in Latin or in Latinised form. The view is expressed also—though in some cases reluctantly—that some special provision should be made to meet the type of case referred to above.

**(9) Question whether the new rules for the formation of family, etc., names should be the same for names to be published in the future**

<sup>38</sup>See page 258 (suggestion (c) on paragraphs 43-48 of Mr. Hemming's 1952 Survey).

<sup>39</sup>See page 255 (comment on paragraphs 4-6 of Mr. Hemming's 1952 Survey).

<sup>40</sup>See page 263.

<sup>41</sup>See 1943, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 55-66.

<sup>42</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7 : 71-72.

**as for names published in the past :** In my 1952 survey I suggested<sup>43</sup> that it might be found desirable to select some date—I tentatively suggested 1850—as the date up to which a name should be regarded as having been validly published, even if it was not then published with one of the prescribed endings. The general view seems to be against a date-line of this type. The papers which have been received do not deal with the further question whether, if the past is not to be divided into sections, the future should in addition be placed on the same footing as the past. Nevertheless, this is a question which, I suggest, merits consideration, especially if, as suggested in (8) above, a concession is to be made in favour of group terms for units of the family-name complex when published not in Latin or in Latinised form (e.g., in the case cited, in French) but as vernacular words.

**(10) Proposed insertion of a Schedule containing provisions relating to the method to be adopted in forming family names from Latin and Greek words :** I suggested in my 1952 Survey<sup>44</sup> the addition to the *Règles* of a Schedule of the above kind. The need for a provision of this sort has been recognised by all those who have commented on this point.

**(11) Terminations for names of categories of the familial group :** The views expressed as to the terminations which it is desired should be added to names of units belonging to the various categories of the familial group may be summarised as follows :—

(a) **Superfamily :** The termination “-oidea” is recommended by : (i) Kiriakoff (Document D.3/23)<sup>45</sup> ; (ii) the Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology (Document D.3/27)<sup>46</sup> ; (iii) Sabrosky and (iv) Usinger (Document D.3/34, Appendix 1)<sup>47</sup> ; (v) Zimmer (Document D.3/34, Appendix 4, Enclosure 5)<sup>48</sup>. On the other hand, it is pointed out that “-acea” is commonly used in Mollusca. See Baily (Document D.3/26)<sup>49</sup> and Keen & Muller (Document D.3/29)<sup>50</sup>. The termination “-icae” is recommended by Moore (Document D.3/25)<sup>51</sup> for the *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*. Some authors discuss the possibility of permitting different endings in different groups.

(b) **Family and Subfamily :** There is unanimity in favour of the terminations “-idae” and “-inae” for family and subfamily names respectively. Jeannel’s suggestion (Document D.3/9)<sup>52</sup> of “-itae” for subfamilies is discussed by some authors but is rejected.

<sup>43</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 72.

<sup>44</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *ibid.* **7** : 66-67.

<sup>45</sup>See page 211.

<sup>46</sup>See page 233.

<sup>47</sup>See page 248.

<sup>48</sup>See page 262.

<sup>49</sup>See page 231.

<sup>50</sup>See page 240.

<sup>51</sup>See pages 216 and 220.

<sup>52</sup>See page 186.



- (c) **Tribe** : All the authors who discuss this subject recommend the termination “-ini”, except Moore (Document D.3/25)<sup>53</sup>, who advocates “-ides”.
- (d) **Supertribe** : Kiriakoff (Document D.3/23)<sup>54</sup> advocates “-ines.” Moore (Document D.3/25)<sup>53</sup> advocates “-ices.”
- (e) **Subtribe** : Kiriakoff (Document D.3/23)<sup>54</sup> advocates “-idi.” Moore (Document D.3/25)<sup>53</sup> advocates “-ines.”

**(12) Date of publication of name** : There is difference of opinion as to the date as from which a name for a unit of the familial group should be accepted as having been published. The majority view is that in the interest of stability the date should be the date on which such a name was so published, irrespective of whether the termination then used was one of the present prescribed terminations. The family, etc., name would be attributed to the original author (see (22) below).

**(13) Selection of family names** : Everyone (Townes excepted)<sup>55</sup> considers that an author should be free to select any genus to be the type genus of a family and that he should not be bound to select whichever of the genera placed by him in the family happens to have the oldest generic name. Similarly, there is no support for the changing of family names when, owing to subjective (taxonomic) judgments a genus is placed in an existing family which is based upon a generic name junior to its own.

**(14) Situation where a family name has been based upon a generic name which is not objectively the oldest available name for the genus concerned** : It has been suggested that in a case of this kind the family name might be allowed to stand or alternatively that the Commission might in suitable cases conserve it under its Plenary Powers. It is to be understood that in this case no change in the type genus of the family would be involved, the only issue being the name for the genus to be used as the basis of the family name.

**(15) Situation where a family name has been based upon a genus, the type species of which is subjectively identified with a species which is the type species of another genus** : Two views have been expressed : (1) that in such a case there should be no change in the family name, since the generic name is objectively an available name ; (2) that the family name should be changed in order that it may be based upon the name of the genus which is subjectively regarded as having the oldest name available for the taxonomic unit concerned.

**(16) Situation arising where two or more families have been established and later their type genera are regarded on taxonomic grounds as being confamilial with one another** : The question here for decision

---

<sup>53</sup>See page 220.

<sup>54</sup>See page 211.

<sup>55</sup>See page 260 (Document D. 3/34, Appendix 4, Enclosure 3).

is what family name shall be used when two (or more) genera—each forming the basis of an available family name—are treated on taxonomic grounds as belonging to a single taxonomic family. This is a straight case of subjective synonymy, it being agreed that the species which are the type species of the type genera of the families concerned are quite distinct from one another. The general view appears to be that cases of this sort should be settled by the application of the principle of priority, the relative priority of the family names concerned being determined in the manner suggested in (12) above.

**(17) Situation arising when one of two or more competing family names is based upon a genus of marginal affinity and in consequence the name of a collective family is liable to constant change owing to differences of opinion on the taxonomic issue involved:** The suggestion made in my 1952 Survey<sup>56</sup> was that means should be secured to protect a family name from constant change where there is (and is likely to continue to be) difference of opinion as to whether the genus which is the type genus of a family which happens to have been established before one or more other families is or is not confamilial with the genus (or genera) which is (or are) the type genus (or type genera) of the other families concerned. The prospect of constant instability in such cases appears to be insoluble without resort to the Plenary Powers of the Commission.

**(18) Situation arising when it is necessary to change the name of the type genus of a family owing to the name of that genus being found to be a junior homonym of another generic name:** This is the case presented by the family names ERYCINIDAE and RIODINIDAE discussed in my 1952 Survey<sup>57</sup>. Everyone agrees that, as in this case the generic name *Erycina* is an invalid junior homonym, the name of the family must be changed to RIODINIDAE, as the name *Riodina* is the name which objectively replaces the invalid name *Erycina*. There is disagreement however, as to the priority to be assigned to the name RIODINIDAE. Shall it be back-dated to the priority enjoyed by the (invalid) name ERYCINIDAE or shall it rank only from the date on which it was actually published? In the latter event it is liable to be displaced on grounds of priority by any name of the familial group of names published between the date on which the name ERYCINIDAE was published and that on which it (RIODINIDAE) was itself published.

**(19) Homonymy in family names:** There is agreement that homonymy as between family names should be prevented. The general view seems to be that, other things being equal, the senior homonym should prevail over the junior one, but that, where the invalidation of the senior homonym would not cause serious disturbance in practice but the disappearance of the junior one would cause such disturbance, the Commission should validate the junior name by suppressing the senior one. It is pointed out that merely to provide that in cases of homonymy the junior family name shall become invalid would create a vacuum, for there would be no means available for providing the

---

<sup>56</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7: 78-79.

<sup>57</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 7: 73-74.

family in question with a name, since the generic name on which that family name is based is not a homonym, even though the family names based upon the two generic names in question are homonyms of one another. The suggestion has been put forward that in all such cases the Commission should take action under the Plenary Powers to provide a suitably modified name for the family without change in its type genus.

**(20) Rules for determining whether a condition of homonymy exists between any given pair of names in the familial group :** In my 1952 Survey<sup>58</sup> I drew attention to the need for a rule on the above subject as part of the machinery for preventing homonymy in family names. This proposal has been supported by all who have expressly commented on it.

**(21) Instability in family names arising from changes in the species accepted as the type species of their type genera :** It is pointed out by Sabrosky (Document D.3/34, Appendix 1)<sup>59</sup> and Bradley (Document D.3/34, Appendix 2)<sup>60</sup> that serious disturbance at the family-name level arises when it is found that the type species of the type genus of a family is not the species thought to be such at the time when the family was founded and which has been accepted as such by later workers. The case specially referred to is that where a genus is found to have been based on a misidentified type species ; it arises however in exactly the same way when it is found that the species currently accepted as the type species of a genus is not the first to have been so selected. It is suggested by the American Committee of Entomological Nomenclature (Document D.3/35)<sup>61</sup> that instability at the family-name level in such cases should be prevented through an instruction to the Commission to use its Plenary Powers to vary the type species of the genus in such a way as to prevent violent disturbance in the meaning attaching to given family names. In the Hymenoptera and Lepidoptera disturbances of this kind were prevented by the Commission in 1935 on applications submitted by Bradley and myself respectively<sup>62</sup>.

**(22) Citation of the names of authors of family names :** In view of the extensive and growing practice of citing the names of the authors of family names, I suggested in my 1952 Survey<sup>63</sup> that a provision should be inserted in the scheme in regard to this subject, analogous to that already provided in the case of generic names. Opinion on this subject is divided. The foregoing suggestion has won considerable support, but on the other hand the view has been expressed in a number of papers that the citation of authors' names is unnecessary and undesirable in the case of family names (as providing conditions for the spread of the disease "Mihi-itis"). Clearly, however, the mere omission of a provision dealing with this subject would do nothing to

---

<sup>58</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 83-84.

<sup>59</sup>See page 254.

<sup>60</sup>See page 258.

<sup>61</sup>See page 269.

<sup>62</sup>See the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, Lisbon Session, 1935, published in 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 20-22, 23 (Lepidoptera cases), 27-30 (Hymenoptera cases).

<sup>63</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *ibid.* **7** : 82.



stem the growing tide and would lead merely to lack of uniformity. It is suggested, as a middle course, that there might be adopted a provision stating that, although it is not normally necessary to cite the name of the author of a family (etc.) name, the form of citation to be adopted where it is considered desirable to include a reference of this kind, should be as follows: . . .

**(22A)** In my 1952 Survey<sup>64</sup> I raised also the question of the form of citation to be adopted in cases of the ERYCINIDAE/RIODINIDAE type (see (18) above) and I suggested a formula for this purpose. Various alternative formulae have since been suggested by various authors, but clearly no final view as to the form of citation required can be formed until after a decision has been taken on the critical question of back-dating (see (18) above).

**(23) Emendation of family names:** It has been pointed out by various authors that no question should be held to arise in regard to the emendation of family names, in so far as concerns the portion of the name which consists of part of the name of the type genus. The spelling of this portion of the name of a family should, it is suggested, follow the generic name itself.

**(24) Correction of misformed family names:** The scheme advocated by Bradley and others (see (6) above) contemplates an arbitrary solution for the formation of family names when consisting of barbarous words (i.e., of any word other than a Latin or Greek word). As regards family names based on Latin or Greek words the solution there recommended consists of a mandatory provision, any infringement of which would be followed by automatic correction.

**(25) Question whether safeguards should be inserted in the interests of stability to prevent name-changing in the case of family-names published before the introduction of the new scheme in cases where such names consist of Latin or Greek words and are incorrectly formed:** In my 1952 Survey<sup>65</sup> I suggested that in the interests of stability at the family-name level safeguards of this kind were desirable and indeed essential. The actual proposal there submitted is given at the top of page 69 of my Survey. Opinion on this subject is divided on rather unusual lines. There is considerable support for the idea embodied in my suggestion but some authors, without denying that the omission of safeguards will lead to name-changing at the family-name level, nevertheless recommend that no safeguards should be adopted, the authors concerned basing their view upon the desirability of keeping the rules short.

**(26) Name of the subfamily, tribe, etc., which contains the genus which is the type genus of the family concerned:** On this subject (which was raised in my 1952 Survey<sup>66</sup>) there is complete agreement that the sub-family, tribe, etc. which contain the type genus of a family should not

---

<sup>64</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7**: 82

<sup>65</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *ibid.* **7**: 67-70.

<sup>66</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *ibid.* **7**: 85.

be given a separate name but should bear the same name as the family differing from it only in termination. Several authors point out that, in view of the proposed co-ordinate character of names for all categories in the familial group, a name is potentially published for every category within a family immediately a name is published for any one of these categories. It is suggested (e.g., by Wright in Document D.3/32<sup>67</sup>) that in these cases no question of authorship arises and that no author's name should be cited.

**(27) Proposed establishment of an "Official List" of Family Names and of an "Official Index" of Rejected and Invalid Family Names :**

In my 1952 Survey<sup>68</sup> I suggested that the above "Official List" and "Official Index" should be established and put forward various supplementary proposals in regard thereto. These proposals have secured very wide support (and also a very small amount of opposition). Bradley (Document 3/34)<sup>69</sup> made a suggestion as to the form of entry to be made and suggested also a change in the title, suggestions which were supported by the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature (Document 3/35)<sup>70</sup>.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.*

28, Park Village East,  
Regents Park,  
London, N.W.1,  
England.

23rd July, 1953.

---

<sup>67</sup>See page 244.

<sup>68</sup>See Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 90-93.

<sup>69</sup>See page 258.

<sup>70</sup>See page 269.

**Corrigenda**

page 59. Heading: substitute "ERICH" for "ERICK"

page 60. Heading: substitute "NOMENCLATURE" for "NOMEMCLATURE"

page 235. Heading: substitute "1952" for "1953"



# AUTHORS' INDEX

	Page		Page
Adams, P. A. . .	116-117	Brinck, P. . . . .	29
American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature	148-150, 263-269	Brown, W. L. Jnr. . .	116-117
American Museum of Natural History, New York	71-72, 76, 99, 132-133, 241	Cabrera, A. . . . .	66-67, 129-130
American Society of Parasitologists . . . . .	100, 165	Caporiacco, L. de . .	7, 113, 185-186
Arkell, W. J. . . . .	55, 127, 197	Carpenter, F. M. . . .	116-117
Baily, J. L. Jr. . . . .	68, 101, 130, 230-232	Cheng, F. Y. . . . .	116-117
Bairstow, L. . . . .	198-207	China, W. E. . . . .	97-98, 160, 279-280
Baker, A. C. . . . .	178 (ref.)	Clay, Theresa . . . . .	163-164
Baker, H. H. . . . .	113	Colbert, E. H. . . . .	71-72, 241
Balfour-Browne, J. . .	162-163	Curran, C. H. . . . .	76, 99
Barber, H. S. . . . .	112-113	Dammerman, K. W. . .	21-22, 34 (ref.), 188
Bequaert, J. . . . .	116-117	Daniel, F. . . . .	46-47, 120, 194
Berio, E. . . . .	30-40	Darlington, P. J. Jnr. . .	116-117
Beuret, H. . . . .	94-96, 159-160, 270	Dehm, R. . . . .	60-64
Blackwelder, R. E. . .	12, 27-28, 73-75, 133-135, 242	Dymond, J. R. . . . .	55, 128, 208
Blake, C. H. . . . .	56-57	Elliot, Right Hon. W. . . . .	1
Bonnet, P. . . . .	5, 6, 7	Engel, H. . . . .	44
Boschma, H. . . . .	20, 21-22, 170-171	Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel . . . . .	94-96, 159-160, 270
Bradley, J. C. . . . .	86-93, 151-159, 255-258, 259 (ref.), 271-278	Ferrière, C. . . . .	20
		Ferris, G. F. . . . .	145, 146
		Follett, W. I. . . . .	65-66, 81, 84-85, 136, 140, 245, 260

	Page		Page
Forster, W. . . . .	212	Keen, Myra . . . . .	70, 132, 240
Franz, E. . . . .	60-64	Kevan, D. K. McE. . . . .	118-120, 191-194
Frizzell, D. L. . . . .	111, 121 (ref.)	Key, K. H. L. . . . .	100, 161, 280
Gahan, A. B. . . . .	24 (ref.)	Kiriakoff, S. G. . . . .	58, 211
Garth, J. S. . . . .	146	Knight, J. B. . . . .	27-28
Görges, J. . . . .	60-64	Koehler, O. . . . .	60-64
Grensted, L. W. . . . .	176-182	Kühlhorn, F. . . . .	48-53
Gross, W. . . . .	60-64	Kühn, O. . . . .	60-64
Günther, K. . . . .	60-64	Laffoon, J. L. . . . .	208-210
Hall, E. R. . . . .	80, 147, 244	Lang, W. D. . . . .	19-20
Haltenorth, T. . . . .	53, 127, 195-197	Laubenfels, M. W. de . . . . .	146
Hemming, F. . . . .	2-5, 24 (ref.), 74, 82, 96, 111, 121 (ref.), 124-125 (ref.), 137-138 (ref.), 145- 146 (ref.), 217 (ref.), 246- 253 (ref.), 264-265 (ref.), 274-275 (ref.), 287-292, 293-294, 295-302, 303-311	Lemche, H. . . . .	8, 73 (ref.), 78, 135, 235-239
Hering, E. M. . . . .	47 (ref.), 49-50, 59, 128-129, 212	Leston, D. . . . .	281-282
Hiltermann, H. . . . .	60-64	Lochhead, J. H. . . . .	79-80
Hincks, W. D. . . . .	24 (ref.)	Manter, H. W. . . . .	169, 185 (ref.)
Holthuis, L. B. . . . .	44, 116, 190-191	Mayr, E. . . . .	71-72, 76-78, 99, 132-133, 241
Hopkins, G. H. E. . . . .	45, 114-115	McIntosh, A. . . . .	100, 165
Jeannel, R. . . . .	186 (ref.)	Medler, J. T. . . . .	23-26
Jordan, K. . . . .	176 (ref.)	Meinertzhagen, R. . . . .	26, 129-130
		Mertens, R. . . . .	60-64
		Michener, C. D. . . . .	42, 65-66, 140, 148, 260, 263-269

	Page		Page
Miller, R. R. . . .	141-142	Sabrosky, C. W. 9-12, 25, 142-143, 171-176, 246-254, 259-260	
Moore, R. C. . . .	213-229	Sailer, R. I. . . .	11
Moure, J. . . .	183-185	Schäfer, W. . . .	60-64
Muller, S. S. . . .	70, 132, 240	Schindewolf, O. H. . .	60-64
Museum of Comparative Zoology and the Biological Labora- tories, Harvard University, U.S.A. . . .	116-117	Schmidt, E. . . .	25 (ref.)
Naturhistorisches Museums, Wien . . . .	13	Schmidt, Hermann . .	60-64
Nichols, J. T. 71-72, 132-133, 241		Schmidt, Herta . . .	60-64
Nomenclature Committee of the Deutsche Zoologische Gesell- schaft, the Palaontologische Gesellschaft and the Sencken- bergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft . . . .	60-66	Schultz, L. P. . . .	189
Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. 73-75, 133-135, 242		Sheljuzhko, L. . . .	54
Nordenskjold, T. R. . .	16-18	Shenefelt, D. . . .	23-26
Norris-Elye, L. T. S. . .	14-15	Slater, J. A. . . .	208-210
Parr, A. E. . . .	166	Smith, H. M. 27-28, 41-42, 187-188	
Passos, C. F. dos. . . .	102-108 121-127, 149 (ref.), 158 (ref.)	Smithsonian Institution Com- mittee on Nomenclature	9-12
Reisser, H. . . .	101	Society of Systematic Zoology (U.S.A) 65-66, 81-85, 136, 245	
Richter, R. 23, 60-64, 221 (ref.)		Stammer, H. J. . . .	60-64
Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology 68-69, 131-132, 232-234		Steinbacher, J. . . .	60-64
		Stresemann, E. . . .	60-64
		Struve, W. . . .	60-64
		Sylvester-Bradley, P. C.	189
		Tate, G. H. H. 71-72, 76, 99, 132- 133, 241	
		Taylor, E. H. . . .	42
		Travassos Filho, L. . .	183-185



	Page		Page
Triebel, E. . . . .	60-64	Wiener Entomologische Gesell- schaft . . . . .	101
Townes, H. . . . .	81, 143-144, 260-261	Wilson, E. O. . . . .	116-117
Urquhart, F. A. 68-69, 131-132, 232-234		Wilson, R. W. . . . .	43-44
Usinger, R. L. 137-140, 145, 146, 187 (ref.), 246-254		Wright, C. W. . . . .	75, 243-244
Wells, J. W. . . . .	144, 261	Zilch, A. . . . .	60-64
Wenrich, D. H. . . . .	100, 165	Zimmer, J. T. 71-72, 76, 81-82, 83, 99, 132-133, 144, 145, 241, 261-262	
Wharton, G. W. . . . .	100, 165	Zoologisch-Botanische Gesell- schaft . . . . .	13
Wheeler, H. E. . . . .	111, 121 (ref.)	Zoologisches Institut der Uni- versität Wien . . . . .	13
Whittington, H. B. . . . .	161		

**PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL  
PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED**

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Contents of Part (pages)</i>	<i>Date of Publication</i>
1/3	1-108	25th June 1953
4/5	109-166	30th June 1953
6/9	167-282	9th July 1953
10/11	283-318 T.P.-XXVIII	30th September 1954

**INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDERS**

**The present Volume should be bound up as follows :—**

**T.P-XXVIII, 1-318**

Note : The wrappers (covers) of the four units in which this Volume was published should be bound up at the end of the Volume.



# **THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

The Official Organ of  
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON  
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

**VOLUME 8**

Edited by  
**FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**  
*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

**LONDON :**

**Printed by Order of the International Trust for  
Zoological Nomenclature**

**and**

**Sold on behalf of the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature  
by the International Trust  
at its Publications Office,  
41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7**

**1953-1954**

*(All rights reserved)*



**THANKS TO I.U.B.S. AND U.N.E.S.C.O.**

---

**THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL  
NOMENCLATURE**

**has great pleasure**

**in**

**expressing its grateful thanks**

**to the**

**INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES (I.U.B.S.)**

**and to the**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.)**

**for the financial assistance**

**afforded**

**towards the cost of organising the**

**Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, July-August 1953**





## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*(Composition at the time of the preparation of the Agenda for the Colloquium on  
Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953)*

### A. The Officers of the Commission

*Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (British Museum (Natural History),  
Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England)*

*President : Professor J. Chester Bradley (Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.,  
U.S.A.)*

*Vice-President : Senhor Afranio do Amaral (Instituto Butantan, Sao Paulo,  
Brazil)*

*Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (London, England)*

### B. The Members of the Commission

*(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent  
re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)*

*Senhor Afranio do Amaral (Instituto Butantan, Sao Paulo, Brazil) (1st January  
1944) (Vice-President)*

*Professor J. R. Dymond (University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada) (1st January  
1944)*

*Professor J. Chester Bradley (Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.)  
(28th March 1944)*

*Professor Harold E. Vokes (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland,  
U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)*

*Professor Béla Hankó (Békéscsaba, Hungary) (1st January 1947)*

*Dr. Norman R. Stoll (Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York,  
N.Y., U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)*

*Professor H. Boschma (Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The  
Netherlands) (1st January 1947)*

*Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina) (27th July 1948)*

*Mr. Francis Hemming (London, England) (27th July 1948) (Secretary)*

*Dr. Joseph Pearson (Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia)  
(27th July 1948)*

*Dr. Henning Lemche (Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark)  
(27th July 1948)*

*Professor Teiso Esaki (Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan) (17th April 1950)*

*Professor Pierre Bonnet (Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France) (9th June  
1950)*

*Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (British Museum (Natural History), London)  
(9th June 1950)*

*Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Warsaw University, Warsaw, Poland) (15th June  
1950)*

*Professor Robert Mertens (Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg.  
Frankfurt a.M., Germany) (5th July 1950)*

*Professor Erich Martin Hering (Zoologisches Museum de Humboldt-Universität  
zu Berlin, Germany) (5th July 1950)*

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

### The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission (June, 1954)

*Honorary Secretary* : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

*Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary* : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

*Honorary Archivist* : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

*Administrative Officer* : Mrs. S. C. Watkins, M.A.

*Secretariat* : { Mrs. J. H. Newman  
Mrs. Prudence Goldman  
Mrs. E. M. Lewis

*Indexer* : Miss Joan Kelley, B.Sc.

*Translator* : Mrs. R. H. R. Hopkin

## INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Chairman* : The Right Hon. Walter Elliot, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

*Managing Director and Secretary* : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

*Publications Officer* : Mrs. C. Rosner

### ADDRESSES OF THE COMMISSION AND THE TRUST

*Secretariat of the Commission* : 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London,  
N.W.1

*Offices of the Trust* : 41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

## FOREWORD

The present is the first of the two volumes of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* which were allotted to the publication of the Documents which had been gathered together to form the Agenda of the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature which it had been arranged should open at Copenhagen on 29th July 1953.

2. The Agenda for the Colloquium comprised seventy items, of which the first seven were concerned with problems which the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, had deferred for further consultations with a view to definitive decisions being taken by the next (Fourteenth) International Congress of Zoology when it should meet at Copenhagen in 1953. These problems were the subject of special review in a series of papers published in February and March 1952 in a volume—volume 7—of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, in which an appeal was made to interested specialists to furnish statements of their views. The response to this appeal was very gratifying, the total number of communications received in regard to these seven cases (including a small number of documents received before the publication of the foregoing appeal) amounting to one hundred and thirty-five.

3. The total number of documents which it was decided to lay before the Colloquium amounted to three hundred and seventy-one and the task of sorting, and arranging for the printing, of so large a mass of documentation was considerable. It was evident by the beginning of 1953 that a major effort would be needed if the whole of this documentation was to be published in time for it to be considered by the Colloquium when it met at Copenhagen some six months later. In order to expedite the publication of these documents, it was accordingly decided to publish the documentation for the Agenda in two volumes of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, instead of in one volume, as previously contemplated, and to arrange for these two volumes to be printed concurrently by different printers. Hence, it was that the Agenda for the Colloquium was published in volumes 8 and 10 of the *Bulletin*. (It was not possible to arrange for these volumes to be given consecutive numbers, for, after volume 8 had been allocated to the publication of the Agenda but before the decision to print the Agenda in two volumes, a start had already been made with the publication of volume 9, a volume devoted to the publication of applications on individual nomenclatorial problems submitted to the Commission for decision.)

4. For the reasons explained in the immediately preceding paragraph the present volume and its companion volume, volume 10, were produced under conditions of great pressure, owing to the rigid time-table necessary in order to secure publication before the opening of the Colloquium at Copenhagen in July 1953, a time-table which made it necessary to pilot through the press

some eight hundred pages of print within a period of about five months. It was unfortunately impossible in these circumstances to devote the normal amount of time to the reading of proofs and, in consequence, the present volume contains a considerable number of misprints, especially in papers either published in some language other than English or containing words in Greek or other languages using alphabets other than the Latin alphabet. The Trust offers its apologies to the authors of the papers concerned. A few other misprints are corrected on page 312.

5. The present volume contains the extensive documentation relating to the first three items on the Agenda for the Colloquium. Each of these items was concerned with one of the major problems deferred by the Paris (1948) Congress for consideration at Copenhagen in 1953. These problems were: (1) the problem of securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature (Case No. 1); (2) the question whether "neotypes" should be recognised in the *Règles* as a category of type specimen (Case No. 2); (3) measures required for the clarification and completion of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the naming of Families (including Superfamilies) and lower taxonomic categories above the genus-level (Case No. 3).

6. It will be appreciated that the documents published in this volume represent only the working papers which were before the Colloquium when it considered the various nomenclatorial issues concerned and that in numerous cases the opportunities for interchanges of views presented by the long discussions which took place at the meetings of the Colloquium led individual specialists who had presented documents published in the present volume to modify their views in the light of considerations advanced by other members of the Colloquium. For these reasons and because in the case of each of the problems concerned a definite decision was reached by the Copenhagen Congress, the interest of the present volume is mainly historical. The documents published in the present volume should therefore be looked upon only as being in the nature of a background to the decisions taken by the Copenhagen Congress and should be read only in conjunction with those decisions.

7. The decisions on the questions dealt with in the present volume taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, assisted by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, together with decisions taken by it on other questions of zoological nomenclature, have been published, at the request of the Copenhagen Congress, by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in a book entitled *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature*. This book, which was published on 31st December 1953, is obtainable from: The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, Publications Office, 41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7 (price five shillings (5/-), plus postage).

8. The following are the references to the pages in the book *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature*, where will be found the decisions taken



by the Copenhagen Congress in regard to the three major nomenclatorial problems, the documentation relating to which has been published in the present volume :—

**Decisions taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of  
Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, on the nomenclatorial problems  
dealt with in the present volume**

Case No.    (1)	Subject.    (2)	<i>Page in “ Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature ” containing decision taken on problem specified in Col. (2). (3)</i>
1	The problem of securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature . . . . .	22-27
2	The question whether “ neotypes ” should be recognised in the <i>Règles</i> as a category of type specimen . . . . .	28-31
3	Measures required for the clarification and completion of the provisions in the <i>Règles</i> relating to the naming of Families (including Superfamilies) and lower taxonomic categories above the genus-level . . . . .	31-37

9. In completing the present volume the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature desires to express its grateful thanks to Professor R. Späreck, President of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology for the admirable arrangements made by him for the accommodation of the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature during its meeting at Copenhagen, arrangements which contributed to an important degree to the successful outcome of its deliberations.

FRANCIS HEMMING

*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

28 Park Village East.

Regent's Park.

London, N.W.1.

9th June, 1954.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Arrangements made by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature for the submission of material for consideration by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its session to be held at Copenhagen in 1953 . . . . .	1
Action taken to secure the advice and assistance of interested institutions and individual specialists on the aspects of Zoological Nomenclature on which the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, invited the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to prepare reports for consideration by the Fourteenth International Congress to be held at Copenhagen in 1953 . . . . .	2
<b>CASE NO. 1</b>	
<b>Documents relevant to the consideration of the problem of securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature</b>	
DOCUMENT 1/1.—Origin of the present investigation. Note by the Secretary to the Commission . . . . .	5
DOCUMENT 1/2.—General consultation with specialists and issue of an appeal for advice in 1952. Note by the Secretary . . . . .	5
DOCUMENT 1/3.—Proposal for the incorporation into the <i>Règles</i> of a provision recognising a "Law of Prescription." By PIERRE BONNET ( <i>Toulouse</i> ) . . . . .	5
DOCUMENT 1/4.—Proposal for the restriction of the Law of Homonymy as applied to generic names. By PIERRE BONNET ( <i>Toulouse</i> ) . . . . .	6
DOCUMENT 1/5.—Law of Prescription. Comments on Professor P. Bonnet's Proposition No. 2. By the late LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO ( <i>University of Parma, Italy</i> ) . . . . .	7
DOCUMENT 1/6.—Comment on Professor P. Bonnet's proposition No. 3 relating to relaxation of the Law of Homonymy in relation to generic names. By the late LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO ( <i>University of Parma, Italy</i> ) . . . . .	7
DOCUMENT 1/7. Law of Prescription. Proposal on behalf of a large group of Scandinavian Zoologists, submitted by HENNING LEMCHE ( <i>Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen</i> ) . . . . .	8

DOCUMENT 1/8 <sup>1</sup> .—On the use of Plenary Powers to establish <i>Nomina Conservanda</i> . Statement furnished by Smithsonian Institution Committee on Nomenclature under cover of a letter from CURTIS W. SABROSKY ( <i>United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i> ). A proposed petition to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature .. .. .	9
Annexe to letter submitted on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution Committee on Nomenclature. Reprinted from <i>Science</i> .. .. .	9
DOCUMENT 1/9. —Views submitted on behalf of the Zoologisches Institut der Universität Wien, the Naturhistorisches Museums Wien, Zoologische Abteilung, and the Zoologische-Botanische Gesellschaft. Note by the Secretary .. .. .	13
DOCUMENT 1/10.—Type localities. By L. T. S. NORRIS-ELYE ( <i>The Manitoba Museum, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada</i> ) .. .. .	14
DOCUMENT 1/11.—Proposals for the settlement of certain questions of nomenclature. By THORD RAGNAR NORDENSKJOLD ( <i>Stockholm, Sweden</i> ) .. .. .	16
DOCUMENT 1/12.—Comments on the Code of Zoological Nomenclature approved by the International Congress. By W. D. LANG, D.Sc. (formerly of British Museum (Natural History), London) ( <i>Bridport, Dorset, England</i> ) .. .. .	19
DOCUMENT 1/13.—Le fardeau des vieilles espèces inconnues. By CH. FERRIERE ( <i>Genève, Switzerland</i> ) .. .. .	20
DOCUMENT 1/14.—Proposals concerning the nomenclature of Family Names and of names of economically important insects. By the late K. W. DAMMERMAN ( <i>Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke, Leiden, The Netherlands</i> ) .. .. .	21
DOCUMENT 1/15.—Proposal that all names placed upon the <i>Official List</i> should be validated under the Plenary Powers. By RUDOLF RICHTER ( <i>Senckenbeigische Naturforschende Gesellschaft, Frankfurt-a-Main, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	23
DOCUMENT 1/16.—Should a “Law of Recency” be added to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature? By D. SHENEFELT and J. T. MEDLER ( <i>Department of Entomology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	23

<sup>1</sup>See also Document D. 1/42.



DOCUMENT 1/17.—Need for power to fix Type Localities. By RICHARD MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O. ( <i>London</i> ) .. ..	26
DOCUMENT 1/18. Categories of Availability and Validity of Zoological Names. By HOBART M. SMITH ( <i>University of Illinois, Depart- ment of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	27
DOCUMENT 1/19.—On Type Localities and Allied Problems. By PER BRINCK ( <i>Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden</i> )	29
DOCUMENT 1/20.—The Rule of Priority in Zoological Nomenclature. By E. BERIO ( <i>Museo Civico di Storia Naturale "Giacomo Doria," Genoa, Italy</i> ) .. .. .	30
DOCUMENT 1/21.—On the question of Type Localities. By HOBART M. SMITH ( <i>University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	41
Annexe 1: Commentary by EDWARD H. TAYLOR ( <i>University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	42
Annexe 2: Commentary by CHARLES D. MICHENER ( <i>University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	42
Annexe 3: Statement by R. W. WILSON ( <i>University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	43
DOCUMENT 1/22.—Extract from a letter dated 18th March 1952 from H. ENGEL ( <i>Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands</i> ) ..	44
DOCUMENT 1/23.—Letter dated 15th April 1952 by L. B. HOLTHUIS ( <i>Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands</i> )	44
DOCUMENT 1/24.—Letter dated 30th April 1952 by G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. ( <i>British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts, England</i> ) .. .. .	45
DOCUMENT 1/25.—Letter dated 30th April 1952 by FRANZ DANIEL ( <i>Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, Entomologische Abteilung, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	46
DOCUMENT 1/26.—Statement dated 2nd May 1952 by FRIEDRICH KÜHLHORN ( <i>Museum, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	48
DOCUMENT 1/27.—Statement dated 14th May 1952 by TH. HALTE- NORTH ( <i>Museum, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	53

	<i>Page</i>
DOCUMENT 1/28.—Statements dated 16th May 1952 and 27th March 1953 by LEO SHELJUZHKO ( <i>Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	54
DOCUMENT 1/29. Letter dated 23rd May 1952 by W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. ( <i>Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge</i> ) .. .. .	55
DOCUMENT 1/30.—Statement by J. R. DYMOND ( <i>Department of Zoology, University of Toronto, Canada</i> ) .. .. .	55
DOCUMENT 1/31.—Proposal of a Nomenclatorial Statute of Limitation. By CHARLES H. BLAKE ( <i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Biology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	56
DOCUMENT 1/32.—Means to be found for promoting the greatest possible stability in Zoological Nomenclature. By S. G. KIRIAKOFF, L.Sc. ( <i>Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium</i> ) .. .. .	58
DOCUMENT 1/33.—Statement by ERICH M. HERING ( <i>Abteilungsleiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität, Berlin</i> ) .. .. .	59
DOCUMENT 1/34.—Statement of the views of the Nomenclature Committee established jointly by the Deutsche Zoologische Gesellschaft, the Palaontologische Gesellschaft and the Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft .. .. .	60
DOCUMENT 1/35.—Views of Members of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the question of the Law of Priority .. .. .	65
DOCUMENT 1/36.—Statement on the Law of Prescription. By ANGEL CABRERA ( <i>Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina</i> ) .. .. .	66
DOCUMENT 1/37.—Statement on <i>Nomina Dubia</i> by ANGEL CABRERA ( <i>Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina</i> ) .. .. .	67
DOCUMENT 1/38.—Statement by JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. ( <i>San Diego, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	68
DOCUMENT 1/39.—Statement furnished on behalf of the Scientific Staff of the Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology, Toronto, Canada .. .. .	68

	<i>Page</i>
DOCUMENT 1/40.—Comments on the question of means for promoting the greatest possible stability in Zoological Nomenclature. By A. MYRA KEEN and SIEMÓN W. MULLER ( <i>Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	70
DOCUMENT 1/41.—Statement furnished on behalf of the Nomenclature Committee at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A. .. .. .	71
DOCUMENT 1/42 <sup>2</sup> .—Resubmission of a Petition regarding the Plenary Powers. Statement furnished on behalf of the Nomenclature Discussion Group of Washington, D.C., U.S.A. .. .. .	73
DOCUMENT 1/43.—Answers to questions raised in paragraph 39 of the Paper by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1952, <i>Bull. zool. Nomencl.</i> <b>7</b> : 187–188). Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July 1952 by C. W. WRIGHT ( <i>London</i> ) .. .. .	75
DOCUMENT 1/44.—Additional petition to the Commission concerning a Preamble to the <i>Règles</i> . By the Nomenclature Committee at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A. ..	76
DOCUMENT 1/45.—Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July 1952, by ERNST MAYR ( <i>The American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	76
DOCUMENT 1/46.—Letter dated 20th July 1952 from HENNING LEMCHE ( <i>Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark</i> )	78
DOCUMENT 1/47.—Comments on the means to be found for promoting the greatest possible stability in Zoological Nomenclature. By JOHN H. LOCHHEAD ( <i>Department of Zoology, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, U.S.A., and Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	79
DOCUMENT 1/48.—Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952 by E. RAYMOND HALL ( <i>Department of Zoology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	80
DOCUMENT 1/49.—Statement furnished covering the views of three members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, U.S.A. .. .. .	81
Annexe 1: Statement by HENRY TOWNES ( <i>North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.</i> ). .. .. .	81

---

<sup>2</sup>See also Document D. 1/8.

	<i>Page</i>
Annexe 2 : Statement by JOHN T. ZIMMER ( <i>American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	81
Extract from a letter dated 21st July 1952, from FRANCIS HEMMING, <i>Secretary to the International Commission</i> , to JOHN T. ZIMMER .. .. .	82
Extract from a letter, dated 6th August 1952, from JOHN T. ZIMMER .. .. .	83
Annexe 3 : Statement by W. I. FOLLETT ( <i>California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	84
DOCUMENT 1/50.—Promoting stability in Nomenclature. By J. CHESTER BRADLEY ( <i>Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.</i> )	86
DOCUMENT 1/51.—Statement of the views of the Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel.	
Extract of a letter dated 30th July from HENRY BEURET	
Extract from a letter, dated 13th August 1952, from FRANCIS HEMMING, <i>Secretary to the International Commission</i> , to HENRY BEURET .. .. .	94
DOCUMENT 1/52.—Stability in Zoological Nomenclature. Answers to questions in paragraph 39 in the paper by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Extracts from letters dated 20th August and 19th September 1952 by W. E. CHINA, D.Sc. ( <i>British Museum (Natural History), London</i> ) ..	97
DOCUMENT 1/53.—Statement by the Nomenclature Committee of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. Enclosure to a letter, dated 28th August 1952 from ERNST MAYR ( <i>American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	99
DOCUMENT 1/54.—Extract from a letter dated 4th September 1952 by K. H. L. KEY ( <i>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australia</i> ) .. .. .	100
DOCUMENT 1/55.—Statement furnished by the American Society of Parasitologists .. .. .	100
DOCUMENT 1/56.—Stability and the Plenary Powers. Extract from a letter dated 8th January 1953 by JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. ( <i>San Diego, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	101
DOCUMENT 1/57.—Statement furnished by the Wiener Entomologische Gesellschaft .. .. .	101



DOCUMENT 1/58.—Statement enclosed with a letter dated 2nd April 1953 by CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS, LL.B. ( <i>Research Associate, The American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	102
--	-----

## CASE NO. 2

### **Documents relating to the question whether neotypes should be recognised in the "Règles" as a category of type specimens**

DOCUMENT 2/1.—Origin of the present investigation. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature .. .. .	109
DOCUMENT 2/2.—General consultation with specialists and issue of an appeal for advice in 1952. Note by the Secretary to the International Commission .. .. .	110
DOCUMENT 2/3.—Extracts from a paper entitled "On the question of recognising Neotypes" submitted by DON L. FRIZZELL and HARRY E. WHEELER (then of <i>Stanford University, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	111
DOCUMENT 2/4.—Reference to a paper on the Neotype problem published by FRANCIS HEMMING ( <i>Secretary to the Commission</i> ) in 1945 .. .. .	111
DOCUMENT 2/5.—Letter dated 23rd June 1947 from H. S. BARBER ( <i>United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Organisation, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	112
DOCUMENT 2/6.—Extract from an enclosure to a letter dated 31st December 1947. By the late LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO ( <i>University of Parma, Italy</i> ) .. .. .	113
DOCUMENT 2/7.—Extract from a letter dated 22nd July 1950. By HORACE H. BAKER ( <i>University of Pennsylvania, Zoological Laboratory, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	113
DOCUMENT 2/8.—Letter dated 8th April 1952 from G. H. E. HOPKINS, O.B.E., M.A. ( <i>British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts</i> ) .. .. .	114

	<i>Page</i>
DOCUMENT 2/9.—Letter dated 15th April 1952 from L. B. HOLTHUIS ( <i>Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands</i> )	116
DOCUMENT 2/10.—Views of seven workers in Systematic Entomology in the Museum of Comparative Zoology and the Biological Labora- tories, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A. (Enclosure to a letter dated 28th April 1952 from JOS. BEQUAERT)	116
DOCUMENT 2/11.—Two statements furnished by D. K. McE. KEVAN ( <i>School of Agriculture, Zoology Section, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington, Loughborough, England</i> )	
Enclosure to a letter dated 29th April 1952 .. .. .	118
Extract from letter dated 12th June 1952 .. .. .	120
DOCUMENT 2/12.—Suggestions furnished by FRANZ DANIEL ( <i>Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany</i> )	120
DOCUMENT 2/13.—On the question whether and subject to what conditions the concept of a "Neotype" should be officially recognised by an appropriate amendment to the <i>Règles</i> . By CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS, LL.B. ( <i>Research Associate, American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	121
DOCUMENT 2/14.—Statement by TH. HALTENORTH ( <i>Museum, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	127
DOCUMENT 2/15.—Enclosure to letter dated 23rd May 1952. By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. ( <i>Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge</i> ) .. .. .	127
DOCUMENT 2/16.—Statement by J. R. DYMOND ( <i>University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada</i> ) .. .. .	128
DOCUMENT 2/17.—Statement by ERICH M. HERING ( <i>Abteilungs- leiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin</i> )	128
DOCUMENT 2/18.—Extract from a letter dated 16th June 1952 by RICHARD MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O. ( <i>London</i> ) .. .. .	129
DOCUMENT 2/19.—Statement by ANGEL CABRERA ( <i>Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina</i> ) .. .. .	129
DOCUMENT 2/20.—Statement by JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. ( <i>San Diego, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	130

DOCUMENT 2/21.—Statement of the views of the Scientific Staff of the Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology, Toronto, Canada .. .. .	131
DOCUMENT 2/22.—Enclosure to a letter dated 1st July 1952 by A. MYRA KEEN and SIEMON W. MULLER ( <i>Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	132
DOCUMENT 2/23.—Statement on the views of the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, New York .. .. .	132
DOCUMENT 2/24.—Statement submitted on behalf of the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C. .. .. .	133
DOCUMENT 2/25.—Extract from letter dated 20th July 1952 by HENNING LEMCHE ( <i>Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen</i> ) .. .. .	135
DOCUMENT 2/26.—Statement submitted on behalf of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology. Letter dated 21st July 1952, with enclosures, from W. I. FOLLETT, <i>Chairman</i> .. .. .	136
APPENDIX 1: Memorandum submitted by ROBERT L. USINGER ( <i>University of California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	137
APPENDIX 2: Notice of a Meeting of the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C., U.S.A., called for 18th June 1952, for the purpose of considering the question of the recognition of neotypes as a category of type specimen .. .. .	140
APPENDIX 3: Comments furnished by the members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology on the Documents constituting Appendices 1 and 2 to W. I. Follett's letter of 21st July 1952 .. .. .	140
ENCLOSURE 1: Comment furnished by W. I. FOLLETT ( <i>California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	140
ENCLOSURE 2: Comment furnished by CHARLES D. MICHENER ( <i>University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	140

	<i>Page</i>
ENCLOSURE 3 :	
Comment furnished by ROBERT R. MILLER ( <i>Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington 25, D.C., U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	141
Comment furnished by ROBERT R. MILLER in a letter to W. I. FOLLETT .. .. .	142
ENCLOSURE 4 : Comments furnished by CURTIS W. SABROSKY ( <i>United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	142
ENCLOSURE 5 :	
Comments furnished by HENRY TOWNES ( <i>United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	143
Comment by HENRY TOWNES in a letter to W. I. FOLLETT .. .. .	144
ENCLOSURE 6 : Comment furnished by JOHN W. WELLS ( <i>Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.</i> ).. .. .	144
ENCLOSURE 7 :	
Comments furnished by JOHN T. ZIMMER ( <i>American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	144
Comments furnished by JOHN T. ZIMMER in a letter to W. I. FOLLETT .. .. .	145
APPENDIX 4 : Extract from the proceedings of a Symposium on Zoological Nomenclature relating to the question of the recognition of Neotypes as a category of type specimen held by the Pacific Section of the Society of Systematic Zoology at the Oregon State College, Cornwallis, Oregon, U.S.A., on 20th June 1952 .. .. .	145
DOCUMENT 2/27. —Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952 from E. RAYMOND HALL ( <i>University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	147
DOCUMENT 2/28.—Statement of the views of the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature .. .. .	148
DOCUMENT 2/29.—Statement received on 25th July 1952 from J. CHESTER BRADLEY ( <i>Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.</i> )	151



DOCUMENT 2/30.—Statement of the views of the Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel .. .. .	159
DOCUMENT 2/31.—Extracts from letters dated 20th August and 19th September 1952 by W. E. CHINA, M.A., D.Sc. ( <i>British Museum (Natural History) London</i> ) .. .. .	160
DOCUMENT 2/32.—Enclosure to a letter dated 26th August 1952 from H. B. WHITTINGTON ( <i>Department of Invertebrate Palaeontology, Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	161
DOCUMENT 2/33.—Extract from a letter dated 4th September 1952 from K. H. L. KEY ( <i>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia</i> ) .. .. .	161
DOCUMENT 2/34.—Enclosure to a letter dated 25th September 1952 from J. BALFOUR-BROWNE, M.A. ( <i>British Museum (Natural History) London</i> ) .. .. .	162
DOCUMENT 2/35.—Statement received on 1st October 1952 from THERESA CLAY ( <i>British Museum (Natural History) London</i> ) .. .. .	163
DOCUMENT 2/36.—Statement furnished by the American Society of Parasitologists .. .. .	165
DOCUMENT 2/37.—Extract from a letter dated 27th March 1953 from A. E. PARR ( <i>The American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	166

### CASE NO. 3

#### **Documents relating to the question of the reform of the provisions in the "Règles" relating to the naming of families and lower suprageneric groups**

DOCUMENT 3/1.—Origin of the Present Investigation. Note by the Secretary to the Commission .. .. .	167
DOCUMENT 3/2.—General Consultation with Specialists and Issue of an Appeal for Advice in 1952. Note by the Secretary to the Commission .. .. .	168

	<i>Page</i>
DOCUMENT 3/3.—Question raised by HAROLD W. MANTER ( <i>Department of Zoology and Anatomy, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska, U.S.A.</i> ) regarding the name properly applicable to the Family containing the genus <i>Dissotrema</i> Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Trematoda). Note by the Secretary to the Commission .. .. .	169
DOCUMENT 3/4.—Examples of Homonymous Family Names by H. BOSCHMA ( <i>Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands</i> ) .. .. .	170
Enclosure to a letter dated 30th January 1946 .. .. .	170
Letter dated 9th January 1950 .. .. .	171
DOCUMENT 3/5.—By CURTIS W. SABROSKY (of (at the time when the following paper was written) <i>the U.S. Public Health Service, Manning, South Carolina, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	171
DOCUMENT 3/6.—Enclosure to a letter dated 5th October 1947 from L. W. GRENSTED, D.D. ( <i>Oriel College, Oxford University</i> ) ..	176
DOCUMENT 3/7.—Notas sobre a Nomenclatura dos Grupos Superiores a Generos. By JESUS MOURE, C.M.F. ( <i>do Museu Paranaense e Universidade do Parana</i> ) and L. TRAVASSOS FILHO ( <i>do Departamento de Zoologia de Sao Paulo</i> ) .. .. .	183
DOCUMENT 3/8.—Comment on Harold Manter's Application relating to the Family Name properly applicable to the genus <i>Dissotrema</i> Goto & Matsudaira, 1918 (Nematoda) by the late LODOVICO DI CAPORIACCO ( <i>University of Parma, Italy</i> ) .. .. .	185
DOCUMENT 3/9.—Proposal by R. JEANNEL ( <i>Paris, France</i> ) for the introduction of a new termination for names denoting Tribes. Note by the Secretary to the Commission .. .. .	186
DOCUMENT 3/10.—Statement submitted in 1948 jointly by E. GORTON LINSLEY and ROBERT L. USINGER ( <i>University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.</i> ). Note by the Secretary of the Commission .. .. .	187
DOCUMENT 3/11.—Letter dated 12th June 1950 from HOBART M. SMITH ( <i>University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	187
DOCUMENT 3/12. Views of the late K. W. DAMMERMAN ( <i>Rijks- museum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands</i> ) ..	188

DOCUMENT 3/13.—Information furnished by LEONARD P. SCHULTZ ( <i>Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.</i> ) .. ..	189
DOCUMENT 3/14.—Statement by P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY, B.Sc. ( <i>University of Sheffield, Department of Geology, Sheffield</i> ) ..	189
DOCUMENT 3/15.—Letter dated 15th April 1952 from L. B. HOL- THUIS ( <i>Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands</i> ) .. .. .	190
DOCUMENT 3/16.—Enclosure to a letter dated 29th April 1952 from D. K. McE. KEVAN ( <i>School of Agriculture, Zoology Section, University of Nottingham, Sutton Bonington, Loughborough, England</i> )	191
DOCUMENT 3/17.—Suggestions furnished by FRANZ DANIEL ( <i>Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany</i> )	194
DOCUMENT 3/18.—Statement by TH. HALTENORTH ( <i>Museum, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	195
DOCUMENT 3/19.—Letter dated 23rd May 1952 from W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. ( <i>Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge University, Cambridge</i> ) .. .. .	197
DOCUMENT 3/20.—Letters dated 26th May 1952 and 9th June 1952 from LESLIE BAIRSTOW, M.A. ( <i>British Museum (Natural History), Department of Geology, London</i> ) .. .. .	198
DOCUMENT 3/21.—Statement by J. R. DYMOND ( <i>University of Toronto, Department of Zoology, Toronto, Canada</i> ) .. .	208
DOCUMENT 3/22.—Letter dated 28th May 1952 from JAMES A. SLATER and JEAN L. LAFFOON ( <i>Department of Zoology and Entomology, Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Ames, Iowa, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	208
DOCUMENT 3/23.—Enclosure to a letter dated 5th June 1952 from S. G. KIRIAKOFF, L.Sc. ( <i>Zoological Museum, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium</i> ) .. .. .	211
DOCUMENT 3/24.—Statement by ERICH M. HERING ( <i>Abteilungs- leiter am Zoologischen Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin</i> )	212
Annexe: Views of WALTER FORSTER ( <i>Zoologische Sammlung des Bayerischen Staates, München, Germany</i> ) .. .. .	212

	<i>Page</i>
DOCUMENT 3/25.—Letter by RAYMOND C. MOORE ( <i>University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	213
Annexe: Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology. Directed and edited by RAYMOND C. MOORE .. .. .	214
DOCUMENT 3/26.—Statement by JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr. ( <i>San Diego, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	230
DOCUMENT 3/27.—Statement of the views of the Scientific Staff of the Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology and Palaeontology, Toronto, Canada .. .. .	232
DOCUMENT 3/28.—Enclosure to a letter dated 30th June 1952 from HENNING LEMCHE ( <i>Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen</i> ) .. .. .	235
DOCUMENT 3/29.—Enclosure to a letter dated 1st July 1952 from A. MYRA KEEN and SIEMON W. MULLER ( <i>Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	240
DOCUMENT 3/30.—Statement of the views of the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Museum of Natural History, New York .. .. .	241
DOCUMENT 3/31.—Statement submitted on behalf of the Nomenclature Discussion Group, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. .. .. .	242
DOCUMENT 3/32.—Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July 1952 from C. W. WRIGHT ( <i>London</i> ) .. .. .	243
DOCUMENT 3/33.—Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1952 from E. RAYMOND HALL ( <i>University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	244
DOCUMENT 3/34.—Statement submitted on behalf of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology, in a letter dated 23rd July 1952, with enclosures, from W. I. FOLLETT ( <i>California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.</i> ) ( <i>Chairman</i> ) .. .. .	245



## APPENDIX 1:

- ENCLOSURE 1: Summary by CURTIS W. SABROSKY of the suggestions put forward by FRANCIS HEMMING in Vol. 7 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* and comments on those suggestions by ROBERT L. USINGER . . . . . 246

- ENCLOSURE 2: CURTIS W. SABROSKY'S discussions of the suggestions in relation to the naming of Families put forward by FRANCIS HEMMING in Vol. 7 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* with C. W. Sabrosky's recommendations in regard to the foregoing matters and ROBERT L. USINGER'S comments on C. W. SABROSKY'S recommendations . . . . . 249

- APPENDIX 2: Comments by J. CHESTER BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) . . . . . 255

- APPENDIX 3: Observations on J. CHESTER BRADLEY'S comments by CURTIS W. SABROSKY . . . . . 259

- APPENDIX 4: Comments received by W. I. FOLLETT from members of the Nomenclature Committee of the Society of Systematic Zoology . . . . . 260

- ENCLOSURE 1: Communication furnished by W. I. FOLLETT . . . . . 260

- ENCLOSURE 2: Communication furnished by CHARLES D. MICHENER (*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) . . . . . 260

- ENCLOSURE 3: Communication furnished by HENRY TOWNES (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) . . . . . 260

- ENCLOSURE 4: Communication furnished by JOHN W. WELLS (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) . . . . . 261

- ENCLOSURE 5: Communication furnished by JOHN T. ZIMMER (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.*) . . . . . 261

- DOCUMENT 3/35.—Statement of the views of the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature . . . . . 263

- DOCUMENT 3/36.—Statement of the views of the Entomologische Gesellschaft, Basel . . . . . 270

	<i>Page</i>
DOCUMENT 3/37.—Statement by J. CHESTER BRADLEY ( <i>Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	271
DOCUMENT 3/38.—Extracts from letters dated 20th August and 20th September 1952 from W. E. CHINA, M.A., D.Sc. ( <i>British Museum Natural History, London</i> ) .. .. .	279
DOCUMENT 3/39.—Extract from a letter dated 4th September 1952 from K. H. L. KEY ( <i>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Division of Entomology, Canberra, Australia</i> )	280
DOCUMENT 3/40.—Extract from a paper entitled "The Suprageneric Nomenclature of the British Pentatomoidea (Hemiptera)" by D. LESTON ( <i>London</i> ) .. .. .	281

## ADDENDUM

### CASE NO. 1

(*continued from page 108*)

DOCUMENT 1/59.—Stabilisation of Zoological Nomenclature, Part 1 : The Suggested Law of Prescription by FRANCIS HEMMING ( <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> ) .. .. .	287
DOCUMENT 1/60.—Stabilisation of Zoological Nomenclature, Part 2 : Possible measures other than the adoption of the Principle of Prescription by FRANCIS HEMMING ( <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> ) .. .. .	293

### CASE NO. 2

(*continued from page 166*)

DOCUMENT 2/38.—The question whether "neotypes" should be recognised in the <i>Règles</i> as a category of type specimen by FRANCIS HEMMING ( <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> ) .. .. .	295
--	-----

### CASE NO. 3

(*continued from page 282*)

DOCUMENT 3/41.—The question of the reform of the provisions in the <i>Règles</i> relating to the naming of families and lower suprageneric groups by FRANCIS HEMMING ( <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> ) .. .. .	303
--	-----

	<i>Page</i>
Corrigenda .. .. .	312
Authors' Index .. .. .	313
Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present volume was published .. .. .	317
Instructions to binders .. .. .	318







## CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT PART

	Page
<p>Papers relating to the cases dealt with in the present volume submitted to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature during its meeting at Copenhagen, 1953: Reports prepared by Francis Hemming, <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i>, in response to an invitation addressed to him by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948:—</p>	
(a) The problem of securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature:—	
(i) Stabilisation of Zoological Nomenclature, Part 1: The Suggested Law of Prescription (Document D. 1/59) .. .. .	287
(ii) Stabilisation of Zoological Nomenclature, Part 2: Possible measures other than the adoption of the Principle of Prescription (Document D. 1/60) ..	293
(b) The question whether "neotypes" should be recognised in the <i>Règles</i> as a category of type specimen (Document D. 2/38) .. .. .	295
(c) The question of the reform of the provisions in the <i>Règles</i> relating to the naming of families and lower suprageneric groups (Document D. 3/41) .. .. .	303
Corrigenda .. .. .	312
Authors' Index .. .. .	313
Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present volume was published .. .. .	317
Instructions to binders .. .. .	318
<hr style="width: 20%; margin: 10px auto;"/> <p>Title Page: Acknowledgment to I.U.B.S. and U.N.E.S.C.O.:  Foreword by the Secretary to the International Commission on  Zoological Nomenclature: Table of Contents .. .. . T.P.-xxviii</p>	